

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, and 15 remain in the application and claims 1, 5, 9, and 15 have been amended hereby. Claims 20 and 21 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 112.

Claim 9 has been amended to change the recitation "program code" to --program--, thereby giving the limitation proper antecedent basis.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-5, 8, 9, 15, 20, and 21 under USC 102(e), as being anticipated by Starr.

Claims 20 and 21 have been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Features of the display interface according to the present invention are a method and apparatus for controlling a display of an image on a display screen corresponding to a plurality of nodes specified by a view. See Fig. 17 displaying a view (v3) specifying a plurality of nodes (n1, n5, n6, and n8), for example.

Further, the view specifying the plurality of nodes is displayed on the display screen based on a tree structure as shown in Fig. 16 of the present application, for example.

Furthermore, another view specifying another plurality of nodes is generated based on a frequency of selection by a user of

the plurality of nodes, wherein each of the plurality of nodes corresponds to an operational function (e.g. CD PLAY, MD RECORD, etc.) of an electronic apparatus (e.g. CD, MD, etc.) in a home network environment. See Fig. 15 and the paragraph bridging pages 11 and 12 of the present application, for example.

Independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

Looking at Starr we see that it teaches an electronic records management system for entering and reviewing data about a patient using a graphical user interface. It is respectfully submitted that Starr is silent about the displaying of nodes corresponding to an operational function of an electronic apparatus in a home network environment when a view specifying the nodes is selected. Starr's nodes (34 in Fig. 2) merely correspond to information about a patient.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Starr is silent about generating another view specifying another plurality of nodes based on a frequency of selection by a user of the plurality of nodes. The editing or updating of patient's information taught by Starr is merely creating a new record to be displayed and does not result in the generation of another view specifying another plurality of nodes based on a frequency of selection by a user of the plurality of nodes. Compare the display of Fig. 2 of Starr with Figs. 16 and 17 of the present application.


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended

7217/66541
independent claims 1 and 15, and the claims depending therefrom,
are not anticipated by Starr.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been
reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention
recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP


Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM/PCF:pmc